

05 Nov (b) (6)

MEMORANDUM

From: Presiding Officer, Brigade Honor Board
To: Commandant of Midshipmen
Via: Legal Advisor
Honor Officer
Brigade Honor Advisor

Subj: FINDINGS OF THE BRIGADE HONOR BOARD ICO MIDN 4/C (b) (6), USN,
(b) (6), CASE (b) (6)

Encl: (b) (6) (b) (6) (b) (6)

1. A Brigade Honor Board was convened for MIDN 4/C (b) (6), USN, on 03 November (b) (6).

2. The Members of the Brigade Honor Board were:

a.	MIDN 1/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Battalion Honor Juror
b.	MIDN 1/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Battalion Honor Juror
c.	MIDN 2/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Battalion Honor Juror
d.	MIDN 2/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Battalion Honor Juror
e.	MIDN 4/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Battalion Honor Juror
f.	MIDN 1/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Member at Large
g.	MIDN 1/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Member at Large
h.	MIDN 2/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Member at Large
i.	MIDN 4/C	(b) (6)	USN,	(b) (6)	Member at Large

3. MIDN 4/C (b) (6), USN, pled not guilty to the following charge:

a. MIDN 4/C (b) (6) has been accused of plagiarizing a 4/C writing assignment by MIDN 1/C (b) (6), USN, on 11 October (b) (6)

4. The Brigade Honor Board determined MIDN 4/C (b) (6) did in fact commit a dishonorable act according to the ideals set forth by the Honor Concept of the Brigade of Midshipmen, and found him to be "In Violation" of the above charge.

5. Summary of Hearing

a. MIDN 2/C (b) (6) the BIO, outlined the evidence of the case for the board members. She referred the jurors to the identical five paragraphs written by 4/C (b) (6) and 4/C (b) (6). She also stated that she would call MIDN 1/C (b) (6) MIDN 1/C (b) (6) and MIDN 4/C (b) (6) (the accused) as witnesses to provide testimony.

b. MIDN 1/C (b) (6) the accuser, was questioned about his involvement with the case. 1/C (b) (6) explained that he had assigned Plebes who had failed to complete their signature sheets to research ten Medal of Honor recipients each and write a paragraph on each of them. He noticed that five of 4/C (b) (6) paragraphs were identical to five of 4/C (b) (6). He told the board that each of their chains-of-command had questioned the two plebes separately; 4/C (b) (6) was confused throughout the process and did not understand what any issue might have been, but 4/C (b) (6) confessed to

having copied five of 4/C (b) (6) paragraphs. 4/C (b) (6) explained that 4/C (b) (6) had emailed him his assignment to print out and turn in as 4/C (b) (6) was away, and 4/C (b) (6) had taken that opportunity to copy half of it.

c. MIDN 1/C (b) (6) was also questioned about her involvement with the case, and explained that as 4/C (b) (6) Platoon Commander, she had been involved with investigating the identical assignments at the company level. She explained that 4/C (b) (6) did not understand that he might have done anything wrong, but fairly readily confessed to having copied five of 4/C (b) (6) paragraphs when 4/C (b) (6) had emailed him the assignment to print out and hand in.

d. The accused, MIDN (b) (6), was then asked by the investigating officer about his reasoning for copying 4/C (b) (6) paragraphs and maintaining that he did not breach the Honor Concept. He maintained that he and 4/C (b) (6) had intended to work together on the assignment, that 4/C (b) (6) had been able to complete the assignment alone, but that he believed his copying to have been legitimate collaboration.

e. MIDN (b) (6) was then able to present his own case. He called no witnesses and provided no additional evidence. When asked by the board why he did not cite the paragraphs he had copied from 4/C (b) (6) in the belief that that was legitimate collaboration, he explained that he thought the assignment was minor and that he therefore did not need to cite any assistance. A member of the board asked 4/C (b) (6) to explain why, if 4/C (b) (6) thought he had not done anything wrong, he had interspersed his copied paragraphs among his own in his assignment and not copied and pasted them consecutively from 4/C (b) (6) assignment. 4/C (b) (6) explained that he believed that doing that would be plagiarism, but that interspersing them among his own work made it legitimate research.

6. Deliberations

a. The board did believe there was enough evidence that would suggest 4/C (b) (6) plagiarized 4/C (b) (6) work.

7. Findings and Recommendations

a. MIDN 4/C (b) (6) was found "in violation" of plagiarizing by a vote of 9-0. The board subsequently voted 9-0 to refer 4/C Benning to his Battalion Officer for sanctions and a (b) (6), (b) (5)

(b) (6), (b) (5)

Very Respectfully,

(b) (6) (b) (5)
MIDN USN